



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROCEEDINGS.

SEVENTH ANNUAL SESSION,

HELD AT NEWPORT, R. I., JULY, 1875.

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

NEWPORT, R. I., Tuesday, July 13, 1875.

The Seventh Annual Session was called to order at 3 o'clock p. m., in the hall of the Rogers High School, by the President, Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of Hartford, Conn.

An address of welcome was made by the Hon. Samuel Powel, Chairman of the Local Committee, to which the President replied.

The Secretary presented his report, announcing that the persons whose names follow had been elected members of the Association:

Professor John Binney, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn.; Mr. W. F. Bradbury, High School, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. N. W. DeMunn, Providence, R. I.; President J. M. Gregory, Illinois Industrial University, Champaign, Ill.; Professor George O. Holbrooke, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.; Mr. Albert H. Hoyt, Boston, Mass.; Mr. J. C. M. Johnston, New Haven, Conn.; Professor D. B. King, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.; General Albert G. Lawrence, Newport, R. I.; Mr. U. W. Lawton, Jackson, Mich.; Mr. D. P. Lindsley, Andover, Mass.; Professor J. J. Manatt, Denison University, Granville, O.; Professor John Meigs, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.; Mr. Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York City; Rev. S. M. Newman, Taunton, Mass.; Mr. C. M. O'Keefe, 45 Willoughby St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Mr. Wm. T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I.; Mr. Leonard W. Richardson, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.; Professor W. G. Richardson, Central University, Richmond, Ky.; Dr. Julius J. Sachs, New York City; Professor Francis W. Tustin, University at Lewisburg, Penn.; Mr. G. H. White, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

The Treasurer presented his report, showing the receipts and expenditures of the past year to be as follow:

RECEIPTS.

Balance in treasury, July 15, 1874.	-	-	-	-	-	\$417.98
Fees of 26 new members,	-	-	-	-	-	130.00
Annual assessments,	-	-	-	-	-	545.00
Interest,	-	-	-	-	-	50.32
Donation from citizens of Hartford,	-	-	-	-	-	84.27
Sales of Transactions,	-	-	-	-	-	97.38
						<u>\$1,324.95</u>

Proceedings of the

EXPENDITURES.

Printing Transactions, 1873,	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$267.75
Printing Proceedings, 1874,	-	-	-	-	-	-	164.90
Postage, express, and stationery,	-	-	-	-	-	-	24.70
Secretary's expenses,	-	-	-	-	-	-	35.50
							\$492.85
Balance in treasury,	-	-	-	-	-	-	832.10
							\$1,324.95

An investment of \$500 is not included in the balances of this abstract.

On motion, Professor Charles H. Brigham and Mr. Charles J. Buckingham were appointed Auditors of the Treasurer's report.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the Association gratefully acknowledge the receipt of \$84.27, the generous contribution of citizens of Hartford; and that 50 copies of the volume of Transactions recently published be placed at the disposal of the Secretary for distribution to contributors to the fund of the Local Committee at Hartford.

Professor S. S. Haldeman, of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn., read a paper on "An English Consonant-mutation, Present in 'proof, prove.'"

In 'proof' and 'prove,' a surd consonant indicates a noun or an adjective, and a sonant indicates a verb. More than one hundred examples of a similar interchange were given: e. g., 'advice' and 'advise,' 'bath' and 'bathe,' 'belief' and 'believe,' 'gilt' and 'gild,' 'grip' and 'grab,' 'practice' and 'practise' ('practize' in Spencer), 'purpose' and 'propose,' 'teeth' and 'teethe,' 'wife' and 'wife.' Such pairs as 'give' and 'gift' do not belong here, the *f* being due to the participial *t*, which is also present in 'descent' (from 'descend') and many others. Some verbs, as 'bequeathe,' 'crave,' are not accompanied by surd nouns. Many words are used as both nouns and verbs without a change of form: as 'slide,' 'scoff,' 'exercise.' In some cases a change of form would cause confusion with other words: as in 'cease' and 'seize,' 'loose' and 'lose,' 'dose' and 'doze.'

The Secretary read a paper by Professor Edward S. Holden, of the United States Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C., on "The Number of Words Used in Speaking and Writing English."

For my purpose I define a *word* to be a symbol printed in capital letters in Webster's Dictionary, edition of 1852.

In turning over the leaves of a dictionary one meets with three classes of words: 1st, those which one is certain truly belong to him and are constantly used in writing and speech; 2d, those which one might use in writing or very formal conversation, but which it requires a moment's consideration to determine to include or not to include in one's vocabulary; and 3d, those rare or extraordinary words which one unhesitatingly rejects. It is to be noted, however, that technical words

are not all in this last class, although a large part of this class is composed of them. In counting the number of words in the dictionary which are properly to be included as in habitual use, one's natural tendency is to include too many of the second class spoken of, that is, too many words whose meaning is perfectly well understood, which would be intelligible if met with in reading, and which yet might not be used in a life-time. I have sedulously endeavored to avoid this tendency; and, indeed, I have gone over many of the pages previously examined, finding not more than one *per cent.* of words wrongly marked as my own.

In the unillustrated edition of Webster's Dictionary (1852) there are 1281 pages of defined words. By actual count, 33 selected pages were found to contain 2383 words, giving an average of 72.2 words to a page, and making the estimated number in the whole book 92,488. Then in sixteen different places, so selected as to give as nearly as possible an average number of words, the number used was found to be 1599 out of an estimated total of 4420. This would give 33,456 words in my vocabulary.

An estimate, based on Mrs. Clarke's Concordance to Shakespeare shows that his vocabulary (with the important omission of all verbs which are spelled like nouns) contained over 24,000 words. Similar estimates give over 17,000 for the number of words used by Milton in his Poems, about 7200 for the number in the Authorized Version of the Bible, and about 12,000 for the number of those which occur in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

The estimate made by the Hon. George P. Marsh, that an intelligent man uses in speaking and writing less than 10,000 words, is based on a definition of a *word* different from that which I have adopted. He counts as one all forms which have the same simple or stem, making, for instance, 'lover,' 'loveless,' and 'lovely,' only one word; I have counted all the forms which occur in the list that is given in the dictionary.

A resolution of the Directors of the Redwood Library and Athenæum, extending the privileges of their rooms to the members of the Association, was presented, and the thanks of the Association were returned for the same.

A recess was then taken until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The Association met in the Unitarian Church, Professor S. S. Haldeman, Vice-President, in the Chair.

The Annual Address was delivered by the President, Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull.

The true student of knowledge is ready to acknowledge himself, with Paul, a "debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians." No apology seems necessary for calling you, for a time, away from the beaten paths of classical philology to the vast, half-explored regions on the frontier of language, where are heard only the strange tones and uncouth idioms of savages. Hundreds of these idioms are scarcely known even by name, to linguistic scholars. Yet there is not one of them that might not, if thoroughly investigated, make some valuable contribution

to the science of language. American scholars cannot too often be reminded how rapidly tribe after tribe is passing away; how many American dialects have, in the last two centuries, disappeared, leaving no trace; how little has been done and how much remains to do for even a provisional classification of all the languages of the western continent. To the so-called "dead languages" of the old world, letters and the art of writing assured survival. The speech of Homer and Aeschylus, of Virgil and Cicero—however marred by modern utterance—is immortal. The language of Egypt is as enduring as her pyramids: Thoth, the god of letters, watched over its long sleep, until in the fullness of time came the unsealing. The Semitic empires of Mesopotamia, and even (if we accept M. Lenormant's determination of the Accadian) their Turanian predecessors, are yet speaking by their incised records. But to an *unwritten* language, when it dies, comes no possibility of resurrection.

The number and variety of American languages seem, at first view, more remarkable than the approximation to uniformity in plan of thought or general structure which establishes among them all a certain family likeness. No accurate enumeration of these languages has been or can be made. Their number has been variously estimated; and one estimate is as good as another, where none can rest on sufficient data.

Is there any bond of union between these innumerable languages, which seem to be radically unlike? Are there characteristic features testifying to the original unity of all, or which at least may serve to distinguish them all, as a class, from languages of the eastern world? The answer must be less confidently given now than it was fifty years ago. As the range of observation widens, broad generalizations are seen to be hazardous. Scholars must be content to rest for the present in Mr. Gallatin's conclusion, that though he perceived and was satisfied of the similarity of character in the structure of all known American languages, he could not define with precision the general features common to all. No morphological classification yet proposed finds a place for these languages to the exclusion of all others. Many of them are as truly *inflective* as the Semitic or the Indo-European. No definition of an inflectional language has been found which can exclude the Algonkin while including the Hebrew. The modification of the root by varying vocalization is as well-marked a feature of the one language as of the other. The inflection by internal change, which makes Arabic *qatil* 'killing' from *qatala* 'he kills,' is of precisely the same character as that which in the Chippewa (an Algonkin dialect) makes *nōshiwed* 'killing,' from *nōshiwī* 'he kills.' Their separation as a class cannot be established by morphological characteristics. There is a general likeness, but it is in their plan of thought, not in their methods of combining the elements of words or annexing formatives to roots. It is the constant *tendency* to synthesis, rather than the means by which its expression is effected, which characterizes American speech. This tendency is found in all American languages, and, so far as is known, is found in the same degree nowhere else. It manifests itself as plainly in a primary verb as in the 'agglutination' of a dozen syllables.

It may almost be affirmed that Indian speech, pronouns and a few particles excepted, is all *verb*. Every word may be conjugated by moods and tenses, every so-called noun has its preterit and future, its indicative and subjunctive modal qualifications; and every synthesis, however cumbrous, may be regarded as a conjugation-form of a compound verb. The subjective element is as dominant

in Algonkin as in Aryan speech. The Indian's first thought is self, his next of those 'like' or 'unlike' himself. His impressions of the outer world are received through his desires and appetites. External objects are conceived in their relation to self. His name for *man* is 'like self,' for *woman* 'one who follows,' for *father* 'one from whom self comes' (literally, 'I am *from* him'), for the preternatural 'something beyond' self—*manito*—and this word, very generally employed by missionaries as a name for God, in Algonkin dialects, is in fact formed as a *verb*, from a *participial* of an earlier verb of which the root signifies 'to go beyond,' 'to exceed.'

As every so-called adjective or noun may be conjugated as a verb, from which verb may be formed again, nouns designating the actor, the action, the instrument, etc., and as the formation of every such verb-noun is regular, so that every new name is self-defining, there is absolutely no limit to the possible enlargement of any Indian language. The ease with which, in the principal North American tongues, new words have been framed for new objects and ideas—the formation being always in strict accordance with structural laws—gives ample proof that these languages "have within themselves the power of progressive improvement, whenever required by an advance in knowledge and civilization."

In the devious mazes of American linguistics, it is easy to lose one's way and forget the time. Returning homeward, to say something about a language in which members of the Association have a more direct and selfish interest than in the Algonkin—a language which, in spite of the predictions of Noah Webster, that a "future separation of the *American* tongue was necessary," Americans still love to call *English*—the subject of the proposed reform of spelling was discussed.

There are indications of increased interest in this subject. The popular mind seems awake, as never before, to appreciation of the difficulties, eccentricities, and absurdities of the present standard-English cacography. The remarks of Professor March, in his address to the Association, last year, have been extensively copied, and apparently meet very general approval. Professor Whitney's discussion of the question "How shall we spell?" has helped expose the weakness of the stereotyped objections urged against reform. Legislators are beginning to look at the subject from the economic point of view, as related to popular education, and are considering how much bad spelling costs the country per annum. A bill is now before the legislature of Connecticut for the appointment of a commission to inquire and report as to the expediency of employing a reformed orthography in printing the laws and journals. The "spelling matches" which, last winter, became epidemic, had their influence, by bringing more clearly to popular apprehension the anomalies of the current orthography, and disposed many to admit (with Mr. A. J. Ellis) that "to spell English is the most difficult of human attainments."

Among scholars, there is little difference of opinion on the main question, Is reform of the present spelling *desirable*? The objection that reform would obscure etymology, is not urged by real etymologists. "Our common spelling is often an untrustworthy guide to etymology," as Professor Hadley averred; and Professor Max Müller's declaration that, "if our spelling followed the pronunciation of words, it would in reality be of greater help to the critical student of language than the present uncertain and unscientific mode of writing," receives the nearly unanimous assent of English scholars.

Equally unfounded is the objection that words, when decently spelled, would

lose their "historic interest." The modern orthography is, superlatively, *unhistorical*. Instead of guiding us to, it draws us from, the "well of English undefyled." The only history it can be trusted to teach, begins with the publication of Johnson's dictionary.

The greatest obstacle to reform is the want of agreement among scholars as to the best mode of effecting it. What seems an improvement to one, is regarded by another as an undesirable innovation, or, perhaps, as a new deformity. Few men are without a pet orthographical prejudice or two, and the more unreasonable these are, the more obstinately they are held fast.

Perhaps the most that can be hoped for, at present, is some approximation to general agreement, as to the words, or classes of words, for which an amended spelling may be adopted, concurrent with that which is now in use. A list of words "in reference to which present usage in the United States or in England sanctions more than one way of spelling," is prefixed to Webster's and Worcester's dictionaries. A similar list, prepared under judicious limitations, exhibiting side by side the present and a reformed spelling—and an agreement of prominent scholars, in England and America, that the use of either form shall be recognized as allowable spelling—would go far towards ensuring the success of reform.

It is in compliance with suggestions repeatedly made, and from various quarters, that this subject has been brought to the consideration of the Association. It is for you to decide whether it is advisable to take any action for promoting and directing the popular movement for reformed orthography.

On motion, the thanks of the Association were offered to the President for his address.

The Association thereupon stood adjourned to 9 o'clock Wednesday morning.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 14—MORNING SESSION.

The Association met at the High School at 9 o'clock, the President in the chair.

The Secretary reported the election of new members:

Rev. Samuel J. Andrews, Hartford, Conn.; Rev. Homer T. Fuller, St. Johnsbury, Vt.; Professor Richard T. Greener, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.

The Auditors reported that they found the Treasurer's report correct, and it was, on motion, accepted.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed by the President, to whom shall be referred so much of his annual address as treats of a reformation of English spelling.

Professor Francis A. March, Professor S. S. Haldeman, and Professor Lewis R. Packard, were appointed such committee.

Dr. George R. Entler, of Franklin, N. Y., read a paper on "A Comparative View of the Language of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah."

The purpose of the paper was to make a comparison of the grammatical forms, syntactical arrangement, and style of the two books, and to show that the results of such a comparison were opposed to a theory that they both had the same author. For instance: הָיָה אֵם never occurs in Deuteronomy, but is found frequently in Jeremiah; the phrase הָיָה צִבְאוֹת never occurs in the whole Pentateuch as expressive of the true God, but is employed often in Jeremiah. Also הָיָה אֵם appears in Jeremiah at the beginning of a verse, while הָיָה אֵם stands at the end of a verse. The reason assigned for the interchange of these two words is based on their meanings. The former means 'to murmur,' 'to mutter,' 'to speak in a low voice,' being especially used of the supernatural voice which was supposed to whisper oracles in the ear of the prophet. It corresponds to the Greek $\mu\acute{\iota}\omega$ 'to be closed,' 'to be shut,' especially used of the lips and eyes, which is connected with the Sanskrit root mu 'to bend,' *mukas*, Latin *mutus*, *musso*, *mutio*. It corresponds also to the Arabic *nama* 'to speak in a low voice.' Gesenius, in his "Thesaurus," controverts Fürst, who derives it from the Sanskrit *nam* 'to bend.' Benfey gives one meaning of the word as 'to sound,' but says that there are no authoritative references. The verb אָבַר corresponds to the Greek $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\mu\iota$, which belongs to the root $\Phi\Lambda$, whence come also $\phi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\varsigma$, *clairer*, and means 'to bring to light,' 'to utter,' 'to say.' Hence אָבַר introduces what is to be said (Numb. v. 12; vi. 2; xv. 2). This explains the use of the infinitive לֵאמֹר ($\text{LXX. λέγειν, λέγουστές}$), as a formula of quotation, particularly after verbs of announcing. The phrase יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ , a title of God, never occurs in Deuteronomy. יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ in Deuteronomy means an Israelitish virgin (A. V., 'damsel,' Luther and DeWette, 'Dirne'); in Jeremiah it means the whole people. The phrase אֵם is found twenty-eight times in Jeremiah; it occurs also in all of the books of the Pentateuch, except Deuteronomy. So also terms applied to the land and people of Israel are different in the two books. Also, the worship of idols or of strange gods is never forbidden in Deuteronomy under a prohibition of "offering incense" to them, which is often found in the prophet. Jeremiah says, "the Levites, the priests"; in Deuteronomy we find "the priests, the sons of Levi." In Jeremiah the use of the infinitive absolute followed by the finite verb with the conjunction וְ is of frequent occurrence and characteristic; in Deuteronomy it is very rare. In Jeremiah the article with the preposition בְּ stands several times instead of the accusative-sign אֵת . Aramaic words, meanings, inflexions, terminations, and constructions are common in Jeremiah, but altogether wanting in Deuteronomy, except in chapters xxxii. and xxxiii. The parallelisms between the two books may be accounted for by the prophet's familiarity with the earlier writings, and his quotations from them and references to them.

After giving an analysis of many expressions used by both writers, the speaker noticed the contrast between Jeremiah and Isaiah. He spoke of the retiring disposition of Jeremiah, and of his likeness to Martin Luther in two respects, dis-

trust of himself and melancholy, which latter was natural to one who experienced the decay of all hopes for the restoration of national prosperity, and who was accused by those whom he wished to serve. The speaker drew a parallel between Dante and Jeremiah. Both combated authorized teachers of religion, and both were sustained by the hope of blessedness which shall hereafter prevail on earth.

Professor Albert Harkness, of Brown University, Providence, R. I., read a paper on "The Formation of the Tenses for Completed Action in the Latin Verb."

Esi, carpsi, cecini, fui, alui, and amavi, represent all the varieties of Perfect Formation known to the Latin language. They are inflected as follows :

1. es-i,	2. carp-s-i,	3. cecin-i,
-isti,	-s-isti,	-isti,
-it,	-s-it,	-it,
-imus,	-s-imus,	-imus,
-istis,	-s-istis,	-istis,
-erunt or -ere.	-s-erunt or -s-ere.	-erunt or -ere.
4. fu-i,	5. al-u-i,	6. ama-v-i,
-isti,	-u-isti,	-v-isti,
-it,	-u-it,	-v-it,
-imus,	-u-imus,	-v-imus,
-istis,	-u-istis,	-v-istis,
-erunt or -ere.	-u-erunt or -u-ere.	-v-erunt or -v-ere.

The most cursory examination of these forms reveals the fact that the endings *i, isti, it*, etc., on the one hand present the most remarkable peculiarities, entirely without a parallel in any other tense in the language, while on the other hand they preserve the most unvarying uniformity throughout all classes of Latin verbs, being precisely the same in the latest derivative as in the earliest primitive. This fact renders it almost certain that they have a common origin in all Latin verbs.

But only three of our representative examples are really independent forms. The others are compounds of auxiliaries—*carp-si* of *esi*, *al-vi* and *ama-vi* of *fui*. We may therefore dismiss these compounds for the present from our discussion. Moreover *esi* has been already examined in a previous paper, in which we reached the conclusion that it was derived from *asasma*, the original of the Sanskrit *āsa*. In the Latin, *asasma, asasta*, etc., became *esismi, esisti*, etc., finally shortened in the classical period to *esi, esisti, esit, esimus, esistis, eserunt* or *esere*. The steps by which this was effected were all explained. We noticed the disappearance of *s* before *mi* and *mus*, the dropping of the ending *mi* with the lengthening of the preceding *i* in the first person singular. We observed also the disappearance of *s* before *t* in the third person singular. We thus reached in that paper a very simple and natural explanation of the peculiar endings of the Latin perfect in the auxiliary *esi* and its compounds; i. e., in all perfects in *si* and *xi*.

But how are these endings to be explained in *fui* and *cecini*? In *esi*, shortened from *esismi*, the final *i*, as we have already seen, is the remnant of the simple root *es*, with the personal ending *mi*. In the same manner the endings *isti, it, imus, istis*, and *erunt*, all consisted originally of the personal endings added to the root

es. If, then, these endings have a common origin in all Latin verbs, it follows as a matter of course that *fui* and *cecini* are formed from *fu-ismi* and *cecin-ismi*, as *esi* is formed from *esismi*; i. e., that they contain the present of the auxiliary *es*, *esmi* = *sum*. Indeed I scarcely see how it is possible to look at such forms as *fu-is-ti*, *fu-is-tis*, *fu-er-unt* = *fu-is-unt* and *cecin-is-ti*, *cecin-is-tis*, *cecin-er-unt* = *cecin-is-unt*, without recognizing the root *es* as an element in the formation, as it lies there entirely undisguised between the principal root and the personal endings.

The fact that this view is not directly supported by the analogy of the perfect formations in the Sanskrit and Greek is a matter of little importance, inasmuch as it is fully supported by the analogy of an entire class of other tense-forms in both those languages. In the use of the auxiliary, *cecini*, as explained above, is entirely analogous to the Sanskrit *a-dik-sham*, and the Greek *ἰδερζα*.

Our discussion seems to authorize the following conclusions :

I. The Latin, in common with all the cognate tongues of the Indo-European family, inherited a reduplicated perfect, formed by appending the ordinary personal endings to the perfect stem, which was the root reduplicated. Among these primitive perfects was that of the auxiliary, originally *asasma*, which became in the Latin *esismi*, *esisti*, etc., finally shortened in the classical period to *esi*, *esisti*, *esit*, etc. Thus were produced in the auxiliary the peculiar endings of the Latin perfect. This, the original type of the Latin perfect, has been preserved only in *esi*.

II. At a very remote period the Latin formed a compound reduplicated perfect by appending the auxiliary *es* to the perfect stem. Thus, *cecin-ismi*, *cecini*, *cecin-eram*, *cecin-ero*, etc. To this class belong all Latin perfects in *i*.

III. The Latin finally formed a new compound perfect by appending the perfect of the auxiliary to the verb-stem, rarely to the present-stem. Thus :

1. Most consonant stems appended the auxiliary *esi* : as *carp-si*, *carp-s-eram*.

2. *A*, *e*, and *i* stems, with some consonant stems, appended the auxiliary *fui* : as, *ama-vi*, *dele-vi*, *audi-vi*, *al-ui*.

Professor W. G. Richardson, of Central University, Richmond, Kentucky, read the next paper, on "Statistics as to Latin Pronunciation in American Colleges and Universities."

Last winter the Bureau of Education, at Washington, (Gen. John Eaton, Jr., Commissioner,) instituted some inquiries with the view of ascertaining the usage of American Colleges. Two hundred and forty-nine colleges had responded. The speaker had been charged with tabulating the results of this correspondence, so as to give, as far as possible, the present status of Latin Orthoëpy in this country as well as in England, Germany, and France. For the information of Latinists, and with the concurrence of the Bureau, he presented the following statistics. He expressed the hope that his paper would not re-open the vexed question of orthoëpy. As a representative of the Bureau, he preferred to preserve an entirely neutral attitude, and to prepare a report which should impartially present every phase of the subject.

The pronunciation of Latin is here classified according to well-known principles, as "English," "Continental," or "Latin" (the last word being used in the same sense as "Roman"). The two hundred and forty-nine colleges are here arranged according to the location, and then according to the pronuncia-

tion adopted. Of the whole number, 37 per cent. use the "English," 32 per cent. the "Continental," and 31 per cent. the "Latin."

NEW ENGLAND STATES.									
English,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Continental,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Latin,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
MIDDLE STATES.									
English,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
Continental,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Latin,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
SOUTHERN STATES.									
English,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19
Continental,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18
Latin,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
WESTERN STATES.									
English,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48
Continental,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42
Latin,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37
PACIFIC STATES.									
English,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Continental,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
Latin,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4

Many colleges which are here classified as using the "English" or the "Continental" pronunciation, also employ the "Latin" in teaching archaic forms or for philological purposes.

Mr. Alonzo Williams, of the Friends' School, Providence, R. I., next presented a paper on "Verb-Reduplication as a Means of Expressing Completed Action."

It was the author's endeavor, first, to explain the origin of this form, and how it came to possess the signification of completed action; secondly, to trace its subsequent history and decay, i. e., to what extent the form lost its original signification of completed action, and to what extent the form itself decayed; and, in connection with this, to show by what new forms it was supplanted.

I. Genesis. In all languages we find illustrations of the principle that repetition of a root adds emphasis to the expression; Sanskrit *li* 'to cut,' *loliya* 'cutting much'; Latin *meme*, *tete*, *sese*, etc. Very early the primitive Aryan people began to employ this method of strengthening their verbs. By the side of the simple present arose the reduplicated present, expressing intensive action. This is the origin of those old reduplicated presents in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin; all were originally intensive verbs. Indeed the Sanskrit in its latest literary period continued to form intensives, iteratives, and frequentatives, after this primitive method, by reduplication, and the Greek has a few examples of a similar kind. This form gradually assumed the signification of completed action, the mere repetition suggesting the idea that the action has been already once performed.

Thus arose one of the earliest tense-forms, denoting completed action, a perfect. This must have become fully established before the separation, as we find it bearing this signification in old Indian, Bactrian, Greek, Latin, German, Celtic. The Lettosclavic alone has lost all traces of it.

II. Subsequent History. 1. Sanskrit. In the earliest period this form possessed no other meaning than that of completed action, and this was the only form bearing this signification. Very early, however, it began to lose this meaning, and with decay of *form* dwindled down in *meaning* to a mere past tense in narration. New forms arose to supply its place. (a) Periphrastic perfects in *āsa*, *babhāva*, and *cakāra*, which are perfects because of the reduplicated auxiliaries. (b) The analytic forms made up of the present of *as*, 'to be,' and a perfect passive participle, are perfects by implication. This participle in *tas*, added to the root, expresses the result of the action, and implies that the action is already completed. (c) The combination of the present of the auxiliary and a perfect active participle not only expresses the result of the action, but attributes to the subject the possession of the completed action; thus *uktavān asmi* is not unlike the Latin *dictum habeo* and the English 'have said.'

2. Greek. Throughout its literary history it has preserved the form and signification entire, and no new forms have arisen to rob it of its functions.

3. Latin. Very early the form began to decay. Only about twenty-seven reduplicated forms remain, but many others show traces of it. All in *i* originally contained it. Several new forms arose. (a) Those in *si*, as *scrip-si*, contain probably a reduplicated *es*, 'to be.' (b) Those in *vi* and *ui* contain the perfect *fui*. (c) Of the analytic forms, the periphrastic forms in active and passive are combined with a perfect of the auxiliary; those in *tus* in the passive may be explained like those in *tas* in Sanskrit; those with *habeo* as the similar form in Sanskrit. All these forms, besides their proper signification of completed action, have taken on also the function of a simple past tense in narration.

A recess was taken till afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

On re-assembling, it was, on motion,

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed by the Chair to recommend a suitable time and place for the next meeting; and that a further Committee of five be appointed by the Chair to nominate officers for the next year.

The President appointed as the Committee on that part of his address which had reference to a reformation of English spelling, Professor Francis A. March, Professor S. S. Haldeman, and Professor Lewis R. Packard.

Mr. C. M. O'Keefe, of Brooklyn, N. Y., read a paper on "The Proper Names in the First Sentence of Cæsar's Commentaries."

He stated that when, in 1807, the foundation of a scientific and genealogical classification of the human languages was laid by Frederick von Schlegel in his

Sprache und Weisheit der Indier, and the Indo-Germanic family was defined, no conception was formed by the learned German as to the place of the Gaelic in that group. Five years subsequently, however, Pritchard published his "Researches into the Physical History of Mankind," in which the connection of the Celtic with the Indo-European family was adumbrated if not determined. And in 1832 another work—now wholly useless—by the same author, "The Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations," placed their affinity beyond dispute. In 1837, Pictet's valuable treatise, "*De l'affinité des langues Celtiques avec le Sanskrit*," proved the advantages possessed by Gaelic over the kindred dialects of Wales and Brittany. Pictet was followed by Professor Bopp, who published in 1837 "*Die Celtischen Sprachen*," and he again by J. Kasper Zeuss, whose "*Grammatica Celtica*," on which he spent fourteen years, amazed and delighted the republic of letters. Basing their opinion on the researches of these profound scholars, as well as on Diefenbach and Jacob Grimm, such men as Arnold in England, and Anthon in America, and Thierry in France, considered the word *Gallus* and *Gael* as identical. But this view is not accurate. The word *Gael* signifies an Irishman.* As the word 'Jew' is derived from a Hebrew patriarch named Judah, so the word 'Gael' is supposed to be derived from a primæval progenitor of the Irish race named *Gaedhil*. If they had asked an illiterate peasant who spoke the vernacular what was the meaning of the word *Gael*, he would have told them that it signifies 'a kinsman,' while *Gal* or *Gaul* means a foreigner. Nothing could be more at variance in meaning than these two words. In the Welsh and Breton the word *Gal* signifies 'foreign.' One of the many commentators on "Ossian's Poems" asserts that the ancient Irish were so barbarous as to apply to themselves and to their enemies one and the same name. But on the other hand, it has been reasonably maintained that no people, however rude and ignorant, ever confounded their nationality with that of their foes—that it is not only unexampled, but utterly impossible; and that between himself and the stranger he fights and kills, the warrior of the rudest tribe makes a marked phonetic distinction. This is a very plausible objection which Arnold, Anthon, and Thierry should have considered. On this subject a learned writer says: "Finding thus that the word (*Gal*) means 'foreign' in all the languages where any form of it occurs, the Editor holds until further proof be adduced * * * that the ancient Celtic inhabitants of modern France and northern Italy did never call themselves *Galli* at all; but that, *Gallus* perhaps meaning in old Latin what *Gal* means in Gaelic, the old Itali called their invaders from beyond the Alps *Galli*, because they were strangers; and that the name continued to be applied to the people to whom it had been most particularly given after it had lost its primitive and more extended meaning. So the Anglo-Saxon *Wallisc*—or the English 'Welsh'—has lost its more general signification and it is now forced as a national name upon the Cymri whether they will have it themselves or not."

Now the true explanation lies in the fact that when the Irish were at home in their sea-encircled Erin, they termed themselves *Gaël*. But when they went abroad, when they invaded what they called *Lochlin*—the continent of Europe—they ceased to be simply *Gaël*; they became *Gal-Gaël*—'foreign Irishmen.' The *Gaël* inhabiting Alba—the Highlanders of Scotland—may be called *Gal-Gaël*. This compound epithet occurs in the "Annals of the Four Masters,"

* See "Manuscript Materials of Irish History," by E. O'Curry, volume i., page 3.

and is explained in a note by Donovan as signifying "piratical Irishmen." It occurs likewise with the same signification in Smerwick's "History of the Clans of Scotland." The Gal-Gael were roamers of the deep—knights-errant of the ocean, who sallied forth from their island-citadel in search of adventure, gold, and renown. Under Hugony Mor such adventurers with the name of Celts overran Western Europe. The Roman writers having this compound epithet before them, naturally took the first and as naturally rejected the second member as redundant and superfluous. They pluralized *Gal* and termed them *Galli*, which they certainly were in that place. As to the other member, it is a remarkable fact—which has never previously been noticed—that the name foreigners impose on the Teutonic race, which they themselves recognize with reluctance and pronounce with difficulty—the name of 'German'—is identical in meaning with *Gael*. *Germanus* is a translation of the word *Gael*, or, if you will, *Gael* is a translation of *Germanus*. *Gael* signifies 'near akin, closely allied, come of the same stock,' and I need not tell you that *Germanus* has the same signification. Speaking of the *Germani* the Delphin editors say: "*Sic forte a Romanis dicti, quod mutuis auxiliis se juvarent, et communi quodam fœdere essent conjuncti.*" That is: "They received this name from the Romans because they rendered mutual help to one another and were linked together in the bonds of a common confederacy." Strabo in his fourth book, as translated by Pelloutier ("*Histoire des Celtes*," tome 1, page 34,) says: "The Germans resemble the Gauls; their features and customs are similar, and they feed on the same aliments. I am therefore persuaded that in calling them Germans, the Romans meant to convey that they are kinsmen and relations of the Gauls." The words which Pelloutier quotes (*ibid.*) from Dionysius Halicarnasseus, "*quelques Celtes que l'on appelle Germains*," may be translated, "some Celts who are termed Gauls." I have not time or space to show how well the writers of Classic antiquity understood a language which is utterly unknown to modern scholars (Arnold's "Rome," volume i., page 200); I mean the venerable vernacular of Ireland. But knowing that language they naturally and inevitably termed the Irish *Germani*—that is *Gael*. Anthon says, "the term *Galli* is only 'Gael' Latinized." No; it is not the term *Galli*; it is the term *Germani* which is the equivalent of *Gael*.

From this it seems obvious that when Strabo says the Germans were "true Celts," Strabo was right. Speaking on this subject, Arnold says in his "History of Rome," "Dionysius divided the country of the Celts (Κελτική) into two great divisions, which he calls Gaul and Germany" (XIV. 2. Fragm. Mai). Strabo describes the Germans as the most perfect and genuine specimens of the peculiarities of the Gaulish race, and says that the Romans called them *Germani*, "true," "genuine," to intimate that they were genuine Celts.

We read in a fragment of the *Ephemerides* that Cæsar, in the confusion and tumult of a hand to hand engagement, and mounted on a "termagant steed," was suddenly captured by a Gaulish warrior, who—likewise a horseman—putting his brawny hand on his shoulder, made him prisoner. At that moment the Gaul heard a fellow soldier—possibly a superior officer—exclaim, "*Is Cæsar e*": "*He is Cæsar.*" But he mistook the words; in the disorder and clamor of the combatants, he fancied the speaker to exclaim, "Cast him free—liberate him." Now what words were those which so closely resembled the name of the illustrious Roman? They were these: *caith saer e*, "Cast him free." *Caith* is the second person, imperative mood of the verb *caithim*, 'to fling, to cast,' and *e* signifies 'him.' It is a personal pronoun equivalent to *eum* in Latin. "Throw him

loose." "*Hoc autem ipse Cæsar,*" says Servius, "*in Ephemeride sua dicit, ubi propriam commemorat felicitatem.*" According to Servius the words used were: "*Cecos Cæsar.*" This would be written in modern Irish, *Caoc* 'oh! blind man,' is 'he is,' *Cæsar* 'Cæsar.'

From this incident, as well as from the geographical nomenclature of the country, and the "Formulas of Marcellus," translated by Jacob Grimm, it appears that the soldiers whom Cæsar encountered were *Gal-Gaeil*—an Irish-speaking people residing in a foreign country. What Leopold Contzen ("*Wanderungen der Kelten,*" p. 92) says of the sacerdotal order is equally applicable to the military caste: "*Von hier war es nach Gallien verpflanzt*"; for this reason: "*In Irland hat sich druidische Lehre am langsten gehalten.*"

The letter *t* in the imperative *caith*, though mute at present, was unquestionably sounded at one time. But when was that? Not when Cæsar was captured by an Irish warrior on a field of Gallic battle. Not 1800 years ago. To find the period when the *t* was sounded we must go back 1800 additional years, to a time—very possibly—when the temple of Belus was not yet mirrored in the waters of the Euphrates, when the sandy desert of Karnak was yet unadorned by the form of a Sphinx. It appears to me that if the *t* were sounded Cæsar would have lost his life on this occasion. The javelin of a Celt might have changed the destinies of the world. But if this be so, it seems evident that Irish scribes have preserved this *t* for more than 2,000 years. "It is a proof of the resistance given by Irish Ollaves and bards to the linguistic corruptions of the vulgar."

The next paper was presented by the Rev. Carl W. Ernst, of Providence, R. I., on "The Structure of the German Sentence."

Such knowledge as people have of language may be divided into three classes: empiric or historic knowledge, scientific knowledge, and philosophic knowledge. The first of these, and especially that knowledge which we have of our mother-tongue, we derive from experience, in an historic and evolutionary manner, by listening to words, whatever they are, by the energy of practice, and by cultivating speech as a fine art. Few people rise beyond this experimental knowledge of language. And it is all-sufficient for purposes outside of ourselves. Fine illustrations we find in the courts of law, in the houses of trading and true business, among those who have something to say. We know a language scientifically in so far as we know it consciously; objectively, in so far as we perceive the living laws which pervade it, though not seen by common eyes. Philosophic knowledge of language is empiric, scientific, and more: it is an art-knowledge, and completely satisfying the subjective requirement. Some minds cannot rise to the full dignity of a dialect; other minds, less circumscribed, go beyond it. But every mind must be absolutely satisfied, must cease to doubt or to believe that imperfect knowledge is unavoidable. We know English and German philosophically when we know them completely, organically, when they give full answer to our last questions. And whatever we know philosophically, that we comprehend by one single intuition. This intuition seems divine before we have exercised it; after we have exercised it, it is no more divine, but the pledge of immortality.

All persons who reason and are uttering articulate sounds speak empirically; scientific knowledge is the result of historical and original investigation (historical investigation is the acquiring of discoveries made before our day; these discoveries form the body of historical philology); philosophic knowledge involves the very largest empirical knowledge, the knowledge of philological science and scientific philology, and that element which constitutes the artist—genius. And by genius I mean an element which we produce by evolution from our own humanity.

Objectively every language is philosophic and perfection. But this perfection is not always beheld by man. Of Chinese, for instance, we have barely empiric knowledge. But portions of Portuguese, Russian, and Arabic are known to us (I mean to European philology) scientifically. Large portions of English are yet waiting for scientific treatment. Many phases and portions of Greek, Latin, English, French, German, may be known adequately, to perfection, philosophically. Every soul that thirsts for philosophic knowledge must go through the same enchanting process which we admire in those who "gehen auf der Menschheit Höhen."

It will be attempted to treat the structure of the German sentence philosophically.

Speech *seems* to be unlimited, for it is an attempt of reasoning man to reproduce physical and metaphysical realities through the means of articulated sounds. Its source is the universe—the world without man and the world within man, the heavenly constellations, so awful and yet so calm and calming, and the moral law within us, the sleeping emotions that rise marvellously without a bidding in our own small self. The end of speech ends only with the never-ending end of human aspiration. It is imperative to limit the subject, since only limitation promises victory. Fasten the discourse of human speech at a mathematical point, and behold! There are certainly two elements—the physical sound, and the metaphysical thought, or the mental reflex of the object visible or invisible. Certainly, one reflex with its congenial articulation is not human speech; at best it is a word, an interjection it may be, perhaps only an animal exclamation. Speech only begins with the organic and unifying combination, with the living union of thought and thought, articulation and articulation. A may be a word, B likewise; the addition $A + B$ is not speech, but a combination of words; the formula $(A + B)$ is better; the full divinity of speech we have only when we have the truth $(A + B) = C$. The English expresses this rather felicitously by its use of the words 'infant' and 'person,' 'language' and 'speech.' The unit thus found, logicians call a proposition, grammarians a sentence. *A sentence is the unit of speech*; its smallest appreciable unit and its largest possible effort. The sentence is the circle within which all the possibilities of speech are exhausting themselves.

This understood, we have one element of certainty gained and may prepare for the fruition of all the certainties implied; nay more, for new certainties. The father of modern philosophy, Descartes, compares the conquest of a single certainty to a victorious battle; to have been a victor eight or nine times he considers enough for his entire philosophy. The combining of sentences constitutes the art of rhetoric, poetry, and all literature. The analysis of sentences constitutes the science of etymology and grammar. Nothing great can be done in the study of language unless the field be limited. As soon as we limit ourselves and have discovered certainties, nothing truly great seems to be beyond reach.

From the nature of the sentence it follows that there can be but *one* sentence, in the same way in which there can be but one square or circle. Every sentence consists of and in a union: the two elements of the union I will call terms. Hence there is but one sentence, a prototype to which all others may be reduced; the sentence consists of terms. In the same manner in which there are imperfect circles, there may be imperfect or unfinished sentences. An unfinished sentence may be made complete by adding to it the one term which it supplements. Terms may consist of one word; but even a whole sentence may be treated as a term.

The two essential parts of a sentence are the subject and the predicate; the subject stands first. The predicate often consists of a verb and its complements; the verb stands first, the complement second. The complement may be a particle, a past participle, or an infinitive; these are arranged in the order indicated. It may be stated incidentally that the particle is always spelled in one word with the past participle or infinitive. Whenever there are any terms besides these, they stand between the verb and its complement, and this constitutes the peculiarity of German sentences. Hence, since the burden of the predicate lies in the complement, the compactness and architectural finish which make German a more excellent instrument for the highest style of art in writing than either French or English.

The terms standing between the verb (and the verb always is in the present or past tense) and its complement are usually objects and adverbs. They are always arranged according to their importance, the most important being the last. When sound and thought go hand in hand, the most important term has also the greatest number of syllables. Often the arrangement is the following: (a) a short adverb of time; (b) a dative; (c) an accusative; (d) a prolonged adverbial qualification. As soon as we learn the harmonious coincidences of syllables not heard and syllables heard, we enter the domain either of personal shortcomings or of personal perfection and rhetoric. Any one of these intermediate terms may be made prominent by being placed nearer or entirely at the end of these terms. Another way of making it somewhat emphatic is that of placing it at the beginning of the entire sentence. This is often done to bring variety into the succeeding sentences and to break the monotony of having the subject always first. But always the verb retains its typical place; it is always the second term in the sentence. If the subject cannot be the first term, it is the third. This is also the case in interrogative sentences having an interrogative term. Whenever the interrogative term is wanting, also in conditional sentences that have no conditional term, the verb stands first. The complement stands first only in poetical and highly animated language. The verb stands first also in imperative sentences.

More possibilities of arranging the terms of a sentence there cannot be; and when we know the number of terms and the nature of the sentence we can compute mathematically the number of possible arrangements.

Clauses, or sentences lacking one term, always are linked to this form by a special term, mostly a relative or subordinating conjunction; the verb in all clauses stands last, or after all other terms, including its own complement. It is necessary to indicate with unfailing certainty that a sentence is incomplete, secondary, a mere clause; and this is done by the term that opened the clause and by the placing of the verb at the end of the clause. A clause, just like a complete sentence, may be used as a term.

These laws may be observed to great advantage in the philosophic writers, or rather in the philosophic passages of the great German writers: e. g., Humboldt,

Lessing, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel. The difficulty commonly attributed to the letter does not lie in the dimness of their speech but in the weakness of minds that cannot rise to the energy of German philosophy. Such minds are also beneath the philosophic intuition of German sentences. Yet all those being true may rise to its living life, and the truthful shall attain to the rare privilege, that of possessing their own souls.

A recess was then taken until evening.

EVENING SESSION.

On assembling, the President appointed as the committee on the place and time of the next meeting: Professor E. P. Crowell, Professor C. H. Brigham, Mr. C. J. Buckingham, Professor T. D. Seymour, and Professor W. G. Richardson.

Also, he appointed as the committee to nominate officers for next year: Professor W. W. Goodwin, Professor M. L. D'Ooge, Professor F. P. Brewer, Mr. A. Williams, and Mr. C. D. Morris.

Col. T. W. Higginson then read a paper by Mr. Augustus C. Merriam, of Columbia College, New York City, on "Troy and Cyprus."

The purpose of the writer was, by a comparison of the Cesnola collection of Cypriote antiquities with those discovered by Dr. Schliemann on the hill of Hissarlik, to show to what extent the "Aryan emblems" of the Schliemann objects are to be found upon the Cypriote, and to exhibit the numerous lines in which the art of Cyprus ran parallel with that of Hissarlik, interlaced with it, or stood as its fountain-head and model.

The pottery of the Cesnola collection may be divided into four classes, of which the first, second, and fourth represent different epochs of time, while the third may or may not be separated chronologically from the second. The first class is from tombs at Alambra, and was found associated with the small terra-cotta warriors and bronze weapons which Lenormant has identified with the Pelasgians who took part with the Teuceri and Danai in the invasion of Syria during the reign of Rameses III., thus placing them as early as the 14th century B. C. Confirmatory testimony of the Aryan occupation of Cyprus was cited from Genesis, Homer, and the Egyptian and Assyrian records, demonstrating that the Japhetic element was predominant in the earliest days, while, later, the Phœnician became prominent, and in the 8th century the Greeks ruled the chief towns.

The bronze weapons from Alambra are striking counterparts of those from Hissarlik, and in the spearheads the characteristic noticed by Schliemann, that they fit into the shaft, instead of around it like the later Greek and Roman, prevails here as well. The pottery, like the Hissarlik, is not only destitute of painting, but all ornamentation that is not in raised work has been incised while the paste was soft, and the incisions filled with a white clay to develop the pattern more strikingly upon the red or black ground. The surface has been glazed by a stone-polisher, worked by hand. In shape, parallels are found in the vases with the long, upright, beak-shaped mouth, like No. 105 (Schliemann, English

Ed.), and those with animal or bird-shaped body (Nos. 114, 151, 152); but no "owl-faced" vessels, or *depa amphikupella*, appear. Their ornamentation is much more profuse than that of their parallels, and is lavished upon the vessels without stint from top to bottom. But the figures are of the same general character (No. 62), parallel zones, bands filled with strokes invariably oblique to their bases, and quadrilaterals similarly filled. Of "Aryan emblems," there are "full suns," "rising suns," both round and angular, zigzags, etc., but not a single *suastika*, or "flaming altar." Besides the vessels, there are 80 terra-cotta whorls exactly similar to those which Schliemann finds so numerous. Nine-tenths of these are incised, and with like figures upon the flatter upper surface, such as Nos. 320, 338, 433, 440, 478, of the English Edition, and Nos. 24, 25, 115, 183, 225, of the Photographic Atlas. As with the vases, the ornamentation is more profuse, not being limited to the upper surface. The longer face, also, is invariably blazoned all around, with figures like those of the vases. They are quite destitute of the *suastika*, and there are, perhaps, no evidences of wear, in reference to which point it is to be remembered that, unlike the Hissarlik whorls, they occur in graves. The Schliemann vases are generally so fashioned that an upright position must be obtained by the addition of three or four legs, or, most commonly, by suspension, for which pierced projections are especially provided. So, all the Alambra incised vessels are without a base, and only five are tripods. But there are some fifteen Egyptian cruces belonging to a variety of which only a single specimen is said by Birch to have been found outside of Egypt, and that at Tyre. These have a pedestal, are turned upon the wheel, and are not incised; but a part are ornamented with a flat, raised, ram's horn curve, like No. 183. Other foreign objects are an Egyptian *lagena*, and a Babylonian *aryballos*. The only signs of paint are upon a small flask and vase, and upon the terra-cotta warriors, whose accoutrements are roughly delineated in red and black.

The second and third classes are from the so-named "Phœnician" tombs at Idalium, situated six and a-half feet below the Greek graves (fourth class). With the second class were found some Egyptian *scarabæi* and Assyrian cylinders. The former may possibly take the place of the whorls of class one. The color of the vases is mostly a lightish yellow, but in shape there are many counterparts of those with incised patterns. Especially numerous are the upright beaks, above fifty, all told. Tripods are infrequent, and the pedestal is coming more into use. Paint has completely usurped the place of incision, retaining, however, many of the same patterns, particularly on the beaked vessels. Beyond these, the stroke is freer, and the lines begin to cross each other, forming small squares and diamonds. None have the *suastika*, except two of a unique variety, and of these a third specimen shows a character which greatly resembles that on the stamp of the Schliemann seal No. 4; also, a Cypriote *pi*, and arrow-head figures like those on the side of the same seal. When compared with others on the same class of objects, they appear to be decorations simply.

The third class differs altogether from the preceding; color of a brilliant or deep red, clay fine, shapes most elegant and perfect in contour, decorations sparing and consisting almost exclusively of concentric circles, the pedestal used in all varieties but one, the upright beak and Aryan emblems wholly wanting. In fact, they appear to be thoroughly Phœnician, as the guide book declares. Hitherto, the devices resorted to for obtaining a clean discharge with a narrow stream from the vessel have been either the upright beak, some modification of that, or the spout projecting from the body. Such is the case likewise with all the Hissarlik

vases up to the fourth stratum, where the expedient of simply pinching the edge of the *oinochoe* into a convenient mouth, first appears. This is brought systematically into use in Cyprus among these Phœnician objects first. In general, throughout the collection, upon each of the indentations formed by this process of pinching, a round eye is painted.

The fourth class falls precisely under the definition given for the very earliest ceramic ware from Greek sites, such as Mycenae, Athens, etc., and may represent the revival of Hellenic influence after Phœnician domination. However, with a change of ground-color to light drab, many of the types of class three are exactly reproduced both in shape and ornamentation, though their elegance of contour has degenerated. Other varieties differ materially. In a jug with pinched mouth, short neck, and plump body, with a round eye painted on each side of the lip behind the sharp beak, the handle decorated with braids that end in a flourish on the vase like the loose end of a lock of hair, and a throat-band round the neck, from which depends an apron, or breast ornament, little imagination is needed to see as much of a combination of bird and human being as Dr. Schliemann finds and names "*Thea Glaukopsis Athene*." Add to this that upon these jugs the true *suastika* now appears in numbers varying from two to six, and in conjunction with these the simple cross, with the "nail-marks." The collection shows elsewhere three small vases representing owls clearly developed, while on the neck of a large *oinochoe* a real female face is cleverly moulded. The natural tendency of the potter's art to extend the province of its productions beyond the original aim of mere utility, even to the fashioning of the vase into some resemblance to the human form, or animal, or bird, may be seen not only in the vessels from the Mediterranean, but in those from Peru and from the Indian mounds of Missouri, where these forms are frequent. One represents a female figure in a kneeling posture, with hands upon the knees, almost an exact counterpart of which is found in a Mexican idol of stone in the Peabody Museum.

The *suastika* occurs upon nearly a hundred objects of class four, chiefly in the form with bent ends, with which the "nail-marks" are not found, while they regularly accompany the simple cross. None of these objects belong to the type of class three. Other emblems are the "sacred tree," the antlered animals (one being outlined in nearly the same stage as No. 75), birds, and the zigzag of four sections (Atlas, No. 3,001), sometimes enclosed in a rectangle of red. The Maltese cross, which is an Assyrian emblem of the sun-god Shamas, and occurs on numerous *patarae*, is never found but once on the same vessel with the *suastika*. A bronze shield differs from the one discovered by Schliemann, in its circular shape, in the absence of any furrow, and in the flatness of its rim. Its size, too, is less, being about thirteen inches in diameter. Of the circular, tube-like vases (Nos. 130, 287), there are several specimens, one of which has the *suastika*.

The question whether the figures occurring are to be considered "Aryan emblems" with Schliemann and Bournourf, or, with Von Sybel, the A B C of that elementary school of design through which man struggled from the simplest straight, crossed, and crooked lines, to the fuller achievement of completed figures and life-like representations, is foreign to the present purpose. But the facts of this investigation appear to favor the former.

Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., presented a paper on "Dissimilated Geminatio."

It is a general rule that every letter in a word has meaning. The exceptions

are for the most part due to changes produced by conformation with similar words in which the letter has meaning, or they are connected with the lengthening of letters. Sound gravitates to accented syllables. A long vowel is well represented by writing it twice. When a consonant is prolonged, or held, we hear the closing of the organs on the preceding vowel, and the opening of them on the following vowel, as separate sounds; and represent them by writing the consonant twice: the first *p* in *happily* represents the closing of the lips in *hap-*, the second *p* represents the opening of the lips in *-pily*. The second letter is said to be caused by gemination—a sort of fissiparous generation.

But it often occurs that the following letter, or some other cause, modifies the sound produced by the parting of the organs, so as to render it unlike that produced by their closing, and a strange letter then appears in place of a simple doubling. This may be called dissimilated gemination.

If the term is applied with a certain freedom to all cases where an emerging letter is made by a slight modification of the final movement of the old preceding letter, it affords a convenient classification for a considerable part of the examples of epithesis and epenthesis heretofore unexplained.

The continuous consonants give the most striking examples, and among these the nasals.

The labial nasal *m* is frequently doubled; but the same movement of the organs which makes *m* with the nose open, will make *b* if it be closed; hence we find *b* appearing in place of a second *m*: Anglo-Saxon *slumerian* (Icelandic *slyma*) changes to German *schlummern*, but English *slumber*; so Gothic *timrjan* to German *zimmern*, English *timber*; Latin *numerus*, English *number*. In English the anticipation of the coming *r* closes the nasal veil as the lips are parting, and what would have been the latter *m* turns out a *b*. A similar effect is produced by *l*, as in *fumble* (L. Ger. *fummeln*), *mumble*, *crumble*. It also occurs at the end of words, as *limb*, *numb*, where the *b* used to be sounded. When a surd, as *t* or *s*, follows this dissimilation, it assimilates the sonant *b*, and in place of *m* we have *p*; *empty* (Anglo-Saxon *emtig*), *tempt*, and *glimpse*, *sempster*, *Thompson*.

Quite similar are the changes of the lingual nasal *n*: *nnr* to *ndr*, as in *thunder*, Anglo-Saxon *punor*; *nnl* to *ndl*, as in *spindle*; *nn* to *nd* final, as in *sound*, *round*, and sometimes by a surd dissimilation *nn* to *nt*, as in *ancient*, *parchent*, etc.

With these are classified the emergence of *t* after *s*, *ss* being dissimilated to *st*, as in *glisten*, from *glisnian*; and final *st* in *midst*, *against*, the second person singular of verbs (*lovest*), and the like.

So also *rr* to *rd*, if found; *ll* to *ld*, as in *alder*; *tt* to *tr*, as in *partridge*, *cartridge*; *dd* to *dr*, if found: and by a further extension of the thought, *uu* to *uw*, *ii* to *ij*, *ig*, as in the Anglo-Saxon and other old inflections.

So also, by dissimilation of the first or closing movement of the doubled consonant, the emergence of *n* before *d* or *s*, as in *messenger* from old *messenger* (*g* = *dzh*), *porringer* from *porridge*, *ensample* from old French *essample*; and *r* before *s* or *th*, as in *hoarse* from Anglo-Saxon *hás*, *swarth* from *swath*.

Lists of words were given exemplifying these changes.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That, in order to attend the excursion for which arrangements have been made by the Local Committee, the Association will hold no session to-morrow afternoon.

Adjourned till to-morrow morning.

THIRD DAY—THURSDAY, JULY 15.

The Association met at 9 o'clock.

The Secretary reported the election of new members:

Dr. J. B. Bittinger, Sewickly, Penn.; Mr. William A. Goodwin, Portland, Me.; Mr. J. A. Shores, Connecticut Literary Institute, Suffield, Conn.; Rev. J. Colver Wightman, Taunton, Mass.

The Committee on that part of the President's Address which referred to a reform of English Spelling, presented a report.

It does not seem desirable to attempt such sweeping changes as to leave the general speech without a standard, or to render it unintelligible to common readers; but the changes adopted in our standards of the written speech have lagged far behind those made in the spoken language, and the present seems to be a favorable time for a rapid reform of many of the worst discrepancies. The Committee think that a considerable list of words may be made, in which the spelling may be changed, by dropping silent letters and otherwise, so as to make them better conform to the analogies of the language and draw them nearer to our sister languages and to a general alphabet, and yet leave them recognizable by common readers; and that the publication of such a list under the authority of this Association would do much to accelerate the progress of our standards and the general reform of our spelling.

They recommend that a committee be raised, to consist of the first president of the Association (Professor W. D. Whitney) and other recognized representatives of our great universities and of linguistic science, to whom the whole subject be referred, and who may prepare and print such a list of words if they think best, and who be requested to report at the next meeting of the Association.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to take the whole matter into consideration, with power to sit in the recess, and to report at the next meeting of the Association; and that the committee consist of Professor W. D. Whitney, Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Professor F. J. Child, Professor F. A. March, and Professor S. S. Haldeman.

Professor Franklin Carter, of Yale College, New Haven, Conn., read a paper on "Begemann's Views on the Weak Preterit of Germanic Verbs."

The question underlying this paper was, whether the *d* in 'loved' is itself a preterit and stands for an original 'did.' The question is to be answered by an examination of the earliest forms in the Germanic verbs. Begemann, instructor in the New Academy for Modern Languages at Berlin, has denied the generally-accepted theory of composition (which makes the *d* in English stand as the representative of an old 'did'), and adopted the early supposition of Bopp, that in Gothic and old German, and therefore in the other Germanic languages, this

preterit was derived from the past participle. Grimm noted a resemblance between these preterits and another form so striking as to overbalance in his judgment this agreement in form between the weak preterit and the participle, namely, the agreement between the inflectional endings of the dual and plural in both weak and strong verbs. Under his influence, Bopp abandoned his idea of the derivation of the weak preterit from an ancient participle, and held that the weak preterit was compounded of the original stem of the infinitive and a preterit, meaning 'I did,' so that Gothic *nasida* would mean 'I safe did,' or 'I safe made.'

The resemblance between the weak and the strong preterit is striking when as in the preterit of *bidjan* we have a stem ending in *d*.

Weak Preterit of Nasjan.	Strong Preterit from Bidjan.
Nasida,	Baþ,
Nasidés,	Bast,
Nasida,	Baþ,
Nasidêdu,	Bêdu,
Nasidêduts,	Bêduts,
Nasidêdum,	Bêdum,
Nasidêduþ,	Bêduþ,
Nasidêdun.	Bêdun.

A resemblance so complete in dual and plural asks to be applied to the singular, and for fifty years the termination of the weak perfect has been identified with the preterit of a strong verb, *dad* or *daþ*, *dast*, *daþ*, *dêdu*, *dêduts*, *dêdum*, *dêduþ*, *dêdun*. This preterit has been referred to the stem Sanskrit *dha*, Greek *θε* in *τιθημι*, Latin *da* in *condere*.

In regard to the details of the development of this compound, scholars have not agreed, and Begemann makes much of this disagreement.

Begemann himself helps to establish by forms from Old High German and Old Saxon, that there was once such a strong preterit as would correspond to *daþ* in Gothic, though the verb-root does not exist independently in Gothic or Old Norse, except in a substantive form.

There was, then, earlier than *têta* in Old High German, a form *tat*; earlier than *dêda* in Old Saxon, a form *dad*. This may indeed prove that *nerita* is not contracted from *neri-têta*, or even that *nerita* and *têta* are precisely similar formations, but it does not prove that *nasi-da* is not compounded, or that the last syllable may not be this very strong preterit in Gothic, whose existence in Old High German and Old Saxon is demonstrated. The only possible difficulty about this supposition is, that we do not know any Gothic laws by which the final *p* could be dropped and the form *nasi-da* become *nasi-da*. But it may be wise for all that to believe that the change *did* take place. More than one of Begemann's arguments reduces itself to the "incomprehensible" of this change.

The agreement in form between the preterit and the participle is the strong reason with Begemann for deriving the preterit from the participle. This agreement may be either incidental, accidental, or organic. The agreement is too uniform to be accidental in all cases. If organic, the participle must be derived from the preterit or the preterit from the participle. The participle is the representative of the Sanskrit participle *ta*, *tas*, Greek *το*, *τος*, Latin *tu*, *tus*, and cannot be derived from the preterit. Is the preterit derived from the participle? Begemann says "yes," and that on this explanation all difficulties vanish. He admits that the *ed* of the dual and plural are inexplicable on his theory, but calls this difficulty "an innocent orphan boy" in comparison with the objections to the

composition theory. The defective preteritive *iddja* is also made to support this theory, apparently because it does not end in *da*. But Grein's explanation of this preterit as for *idda*, he mentions in a note, but does not seriously consider. Apropos of *iddja*, Begemann says: "Linguistic facts do not allow themselves to be adapted to measuring rules." But an anomalous *iddja* without any generating participle is here assumed as the "most brilliant confirmation" of the theory that the weak preterit is the offspring of the participle. Furthermore, in support of this theory an anomalous second person singular *saisost* dictates a second personal singular ending *st* to the preterit of all strong verbs, and becomes in Gothic "eine durchgreifende Regel." But to crown all, the *ddj* in *iddja* suggests and imposes a new form of comparison (*dj*) on all Indo-Germanic adjectives!

Begemann's second treatise deals with the difficulty presented by many that a transitive tense is not to be derived from a passive participle. Building on Von der Gabelentz's treatise in the reports of the Royal Saxon Society, he endeavors to prove these propositions: (a) passivity develops itself from activity through the medium of reflexiveness; (b) reflexiveness is expressed formally, or results from the conception and remains unmarked; (c) in the verb the usage is various, while in the noun reflexiveness lies only in the conception. The different Indo-European languages are examined and found to contain many participles, passive in form with active significations. The Gothic presents fewer than the Middle German. Begemann claims that it is because of the scantiness of the records. But it seems most improbable that enough past participles retained an active meaning in the primeval Germanic period to give an active meaning to all words or verbal forms derived from them.

The analogy between the participial perfect in the Iranian languages and this preterit is exhibited. But the analogy is *first* assumed, and the Lithuanian, which, according to its investigators, is the connecting link, both in grammar and word-fund, between the Germanic and the Aryan, presents us a compound past tense, possibly a compound of the very stem which has been found in the final syllable of *nasida*. An analogy from the Hungarian, belonging to the Finnish class of languages, is worth little here.

The organic development of the weak preterit from the ancient participle is then not proven. But is it incidental, that is in many cases the result of assimilation? Such is the meaning of Bopp's "Schutzbündniss," and such must be the truth, as for instance, in English the *l* of *would* has forced its way into the preterit of *can*, and the *o* of the preterit of *will* is found in *won't*. This incidental agreement cannot exclude the accidental in some cases, as in *nasi-da*, *nas'ips*.

Dropping derivation of the preterit from the participle, "the incomprehensible" of the loss of the final *d* in *nasi-dad* (the first form according to the composition theory) and the contraction of the appended verb in the Old High German plural is rendered somewhat natural by the loss of the dual in the other old Germanic tongues. This loss shows a tendency to disregard the fulness of the old inflectional forms. Moreover, the persistence of the vowel personal-endings in Old High German and Old Norse involves fuller vowels and stronger elements than those of the personal-endings of the presents or participial stem-endings in a will account for.

The old theory must be regarded in view of these facts and considerations as not overthrown by Begemann, though great credit is due him for the establishment of certain points bearing on the question.

Professor J. B. Sewall read a paper by Mr. William A. Goodwin, of Portland, Me., on "The Word 'Juise'—Its Pronunciation in Worcester's and Webster's Dictionaries."

Both Worcester and Webster give the word 'juise,' pronounced *jus* with a long *u*, and defined 'justice,' 'judgment,' referring to Gower and noting the word as obsolete. In Pauli's edition of Gower's "*Confessio Amantis*," at least two instances of the use of *juise* are found. The first is as follows:

All sodeinly the stone shall fall
As Daniel it hath beknowe,
Which all this world shal overthrowe;
And every man shal then arise
To joie or elles to *juise*. (Vol. i., page 38.)

This must be scanned so as to make *juise* a dissyllable, rhyming with *arise* and pronounced *jew-ize*.

Again:

And saide unto her in this wise:
O beste of helle, in what *juise*
Hast thou deserved for to deie (Ib., page 202.)

This is clearly a dissyllable, the accent falling on *ise*. Chaucer spells the same word 'jewise,' and Halliwell's Archaic Dictionary has it defined 'punishment':

I am thy mortal fo, and it am I
That loveth so hot, Emelie the bright,
That I wold dien present in hire sight.
Therefore I axe deth and my *jewise*,
But sle my felaw in the same wise. (Cant. Tales, 1741.)

The word is still a dissyllable, rhyming with 'wise.'

Another instance from Chaucer:

The king commanded his constable anon,
Up peine of hanging and of high *jewise*,
That he ne shulde soffren, in no wise,
Custance within his regne for to abide. (Ib., 5215.)

Another form of the word appears in Wright's edition of the "Deposition of Richard II." (page 26), as follows:

Ther nas rial of the rewme that hem durste rebuke,
Ne juge ne justice that *jewise* durste hem deme.

This has no strictly limited measure, being simply alliterative verse; but making the cesural pause after 'rewme' in the first line, and 'justice' in the second, 'jewise' steps off promptly on its two feet where 'juice' might limp on one.

Still another form occurs in Wright's edition of *Piers Ploughman* (page 392):

And if the kyng of that kyngdom
Come in that tyme
There feloun thole sholde
Deeth or oother *jwaise*,
Lawe, wolde he yere hym lyf
If he lokyd on hym?

This is also alliterative verse, with scarcely as much of metre as can be found running throughout "The Deposition"; and, contrary to the before named examples, the accent naturally falls on the first syllable of the word; but it will still not be 'juice' but 'jewise,' following the trochees 'kyngdom' 'tyme,' 'feloun,' 'sholde,' and many others in the immediate context. From these instances, which are all I can now adduce, I do not think there can be any *juice* in the word, and I fear that the discussion of the question will prove to be dry reading; howbeit, "fair play is a jewel." Would it not be a luxury to roam about among our letters and combine them at will, as the above-quoted eminent spellers did, without fear of being snapped up by any school-boy fresh from a spelling-match?

Mr. Charles D. Morris, of Lake Mohegan, Peekskill, N. Y., read the next paper, on "Some Forms of Greek Conditional Sentences."

This paper was designed to criticize certain statements of Professor Goodwin as to the import of some forms of the Greek conditional sentence, as laid down in his books and enforced in a paper read before the Association at its Easton meeting. The point specially controverted was, that between conditions expressed by *ἐάν* with the subjunctive and *εἰ* with the optative there is no distinction except that the former is a "more vivid" mode of statement than the latter. It was maintained on the contrary that, if sentences truly typical be selected, it can be seen that one of these forms cannot be substituted for the other without introducing a change so great that, while the one is felt to be perfectly appropriate to the circumstances, the other could not have been used by the speaker without his being conscious that he was talking nonsense. The passages quoted to establish this position were AESCH. Agam. 36:

οἶκος δ' αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβει,
σάφιστατ' ἂν λέξειεν,

and ARIST. Nub. 754:

εἰ μηκέτ' ἀνατέλλοι σελήνη μηδαμοῦ,
οἶκ ἂν ἀποδοίην τοὺς τόκους.

These were written on the blackboard, and parallel to each the following suggested modifications:

οἶκος δ' αὐτός, ἢν φθογγὴν λάβῃ,
λέξει σάφιστατ',

and

ἢν μηκέτ' ἀνατέλλῃ σελήνη μηδαμοῦ,
οὕτως ἀποδώσω τοὺς τόκους:

and the question was submitted to the judgment of the Association, whether the watchman or Strepsiades could possibly have expressed himself in the latter way; and the opinion was strongly maintained that no instance can be found in which a future supposition as to a thing *known to be impossible*, such as a *change in the order of nature*, is expressed otherwise than by *εἰ* with the optative, unless indeed it is expressed otherwise for rhetorical purposes, or in the manner of a prophet.

The speaker controverted also the statement of Professor Goodwin, that the proverbial expression, "if the sky falls we shall catch larks," must be translated by *ἢν* with the subjunctive; as

ἦν γὰρ πέσωσιν οὐρανοί, μάλ' εὐχερῶς
τῶρνίθια ληψόμεσθα :

and it was maintained that, unless expressed rhetorically or prophetically, it must be rendered :

εἰ γὰρ πέσοιεν οὐρανοί, μάλ' εὐχερῶς
τῶρνίθι' ἂν λάβοιμεν

The conclusion was, therefore, that *εἰ* with the optative expresses a supposition lying consciously within the range of the ideal, while *ἦν* with the subjunctive expresses one to which attaches a greater or less expectation that it will or may conceivably come within the range of the actual; and that, while in a large number of instances the thought may be expressed in either one way or the other according as the mind of the speaker happens to regard the matter, still, if the character of the supposition be such as to necessitate a consciousness of the nature of the case, one form will be necessary to the exclusion of the other.

Professor Fisk P. Brewer, of the University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C., next read a paper on "The English Suffix *ist*."

It is a common observation that many nouns have been formed lately with the ending *ist*. This suffix in such words as 'artist,' 'jurist,' and 'evangelist,' has been introduced into English from the Greek, where it is a compound. It differs from the old agent-suffix *er* in being more limited. It denotes only the personal agent, while a noun in *er*, as 'baker,' may denote either a person or a thing. Where there is a cognate verb in *ize*, as 'eulogize' or 'plagiarize,' the noun in *ist* may signify the person who does an individual act; but all other derivatives in *ist* are formed from nouns, substantive or adjective, and they denote only the habitual agent. Thus, a 'copyist' is one who makes a business of copying; but one who copies only as occasion requires, is a 'copier,' not a 'copyist.' Among habitual agents are included those whose business concerns itself with some particular article, as 'tobacconists,' or department of knowledge, as 'philologists,' and those who advocate some theory, as 'Darwinists,' or some policy, as 'inflationists.'

With the progress of civilization there is going on a great subdivision of employments and of departments of learning, and it is fortunate that a suffix has been found in English which can be used almost exclusively for forming names of men with reference to their business and pursuits, their theories and principles. Its increasing use is justified by its utility.

Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Penn., read the last paper of the morning, on "The Immaturity of Shakespeare as shown in Hamlet."

An examination of the works of Shakespeare in the order of their composition shows that he rose very slowly to the heights of his power. He worked for years dramatizing popular tales with a comic vein, and then years more on patriotic parts of English history, before he tried the grand tragic style. After the love story of Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet was his first tragedy, and it has some of the defects as well as the merits of such a work. It was probably long in hand. The following topics were discussed to exhibit traits of age or immaturity :

1. The meter. The formal metrical peculiarities of the early plays were pointed out and the later changes. In *Hamlet*, it was said, the early rhymes and formal restraints have gone, but there is still care and finish, perfect art without the negligences of the latest period.

2. There are many things which are not natural utterances of the characters to carry out the thought of the play; but good things brought in to make hits:

Allusions to matters of the day, such as the talk about the children players; Act ii. 2, the actor who played *Hamlet*, "fat and scant of breath"; and perhaps allusions to *Mary Queen of Scots*.

Taking off the fashionable style of speech, as in *Polonius's* imitation of *Euphues*, and the ranting passage of the player in the style of *Marlowe*.

Good things from his own common-place book, such as the advice to players, and large parts of the soliloquies, on the badness of the world in general, the effect of prayer, and the like.

3. The want of lively characterization of the subordinate characters. Many of them talk a good deal, but they leave no impression.

4. The youthful point of view from which the characters are seen. *Ophelia* is ripe in age; her sagacious father is a superannuated bore. Doubt is depth. Made up minds seem superficial. Not so with *Miranda* and *Prospero*, or *Perdita* and *Polyxenes*.

5. Immature view of the problems of life and death. The writer is wrestling with them. By and by *Shakespeare* quietly gave them up, and was a cheerful believer that "we are such stuff as dreams are made of, and our little life is rounded with a sleep."

6. Immature treatment of the ghost. In the later plays the ghosts are apparitions of unhinged minds; the *Hamlet* ghost is the simple ghost of the story-books, visible to vulgar eyes, and what with his poses and long-winded declamation on the stage, and his moveable subterranean noises, is a common-place creation, a "poor ghost." *Hamlet* does not quite believe in him.

7. Immature treatment of insanity. *Shakespeare* had not so fully mastered this subject as to give the reins to his imagination, but made *Hamlet* and *Ophelia* speak by a theory, according to which the intolerable grossness of *Hamlet* was the necessary utterance of madness in his circumstances. The writer of *Lear* would have felt that such grossness was no subject for art.

8. The general atmosphere of lechery.

9. The character of *Hamlet* is not brought to unity. Some passages seem to have been taken up from the old play, in which *Hamlet* has a different character from *Shakespeare's* prevailing thought of him. This, combined with the defective handling of his insanity, is the solution of the enigma of his character.

A recess was then taken until evening.

EVENING SESSION.

The Secretary reported the election of new members:

Professor W. H. Whitsitt, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S. C.; Professor W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.

On recommendation of the Executive Committee, it was adopted

as a standing rule, that no paper read before the Association shall exceed forty-five minutes in length, except by special vote of the Association.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the Executive Committee be instructed to forward to the members of the Association, with the notice of the annual meeting, such information as may have previously reached them as to the subject matter of papers intended to be presented to the Association; and that to this end each member of the Association intending to present any paper be requested to inform the Executive Committee of its title at least two months before the meeting.

The committee on the place and the time of the next meeting recommended that the next meeting be held in New York City, on Tuesday, July 18th, 1876.

On motion, the report of the committee was accepted, and the recommendation therein contained was adopted.

Dr. L. A. Sherman, of New Haven, Conn., read a paper on "Some Facts from a Grammatical Analysis of 'The Owl and the Nightingale.'"

Attention was called to the small research which has as yet been made into the grammatical forms and usages of the English language, in the middle period between Anglo-Saxon and Chaucer. Manifestly nothing can be affirmed with exactness concerning English at this stage, until order has been brought out of the chaos of individualities, and all differences of vocabulary and inflection have been brought to light and classified by careful analysis. From such an examination into the grammatical character of the Southern English poem of "The Owl and the Nightingale," a few facts were quoted. The poem is in many respects remarkable. It appears to have been written by a priest, and not earlier than 1250; but there is no certainty as to its author or its date. In spite of the comparatively late date of its composition, it shows, first, a singularly close adherence in inflections to the Anglo-Saxon norm; secondly, a like careful adherence, in the main, in the gender of its nouns to their Anglo-Saxon primitives; thirdly, an unusual paucity of French words.

On the preservation of inflections the first feature noticed is the continued presence of the strong and weak declension in the noun and adjective. The strong has nearly unified the dative and accusative cases in both numbers, and has begun to employ *-s* as a plural ending to feminine and neuter nouns. The weak nouns have changed *-an* to *-e*. The adjective employs strong and weak forms in the same way as Anglo-Saxon with but very few exceptions, and has shortened *-an* to *-e*. The pronoun has begun to lose the distinction between the dative and accusative relation. The pronoun *huo* is only interrogative, *pe* and *jah* being employed as relatives.

The verb is almost entirely unaltered. The plural of *am*, *art*, *is*, is always *beop*, which form occurs five times also for *is*.

In negative sentences as many as three negatives are frequently met with, but two must be *compound*.

In gender, the masculine is still found in such words as *drem, song, red, wrenche, dep, wei, lust, dom, cwed*; the feminine in *stefne, murpe, heorte, lufe, speche*. Not infrequently the nominative singular of nouns shows an inorganic -e.

A paper by Professor W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., entitled "Remarks on Some Points of the Solonic Legislation," was read by title in the absence of the author.

The committee to nominate officers for the next year, presented nominations as follows:

For *President*—Professor Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

For *Vice-Presidents*—Professor S. S. Haldeman (of the University of Pennsylvania), Chickies, Penn., and Professor Frederick D. Allen, Cincinnati, O.

For *Secretary and Curator*—Professor Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

For *Treasurer*—Mr. Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

For additional members of the *Executive Committee*—

Chancellor Howard Crosby, University of New York, New York City.

Professor James P. Boyce, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S. C.

Professor W. G. Richardson, Central University, Richmond, Ky.

Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.

Professor Wm. D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The report was accepted, and the persons therein named were declared elected to the offices to which they were respectively nominated.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the thanks of this Association are due to the citizens of Newport, who have so cordially tendered their hospitalities and so generously provided for the comfort of the members present at this meeting, and particularly for the very pleasant excursion to Rocky Point; to the gentlemen of the Local Committee, for their kind attentions; to the Newport School Committee and the authorities of the Unitarian Society, for the use of the Rogers High School building and of the church edifice; to the officers of the People's and of the Redwood Libraries, for the kind invitations received from them; and to Mr. A. J. Ward for the copies of *The Daily News* furnished to the members.

The minutes of the meeting having been read and approved,

On motion, the Association adjourned.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1875-6.

— ♦ —

PRESIDENT.

ALBERT HARKNESS.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

S. S. HALDEMAN,
FREDERICK D. ALLEN.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

SAMUEL HART.

TREASURER.

CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and—

HOWARD CROSBY,
JAMES P. BOYCE,
W. G. RICHARDSON,
J. HAMMOND TRUMBULL,
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

- Frederic D. Allen, Cincinnati, O.
Joseph H. Allen, Cambridge, Mass.
William F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Ct.
N. L. Andrews, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Samuel J. Andrews, Hartford, Ct.
Albert N. Arnold, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
George F. Arnold, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Stephen G. Barnes, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.
John G. Barton, College of the City of New York.
H. Louis Baugher, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
Nehemiah W. Benedict, Free Academy, Rochester, N. Y.
John Binney, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Ct.
J. B. Bittinger, Sewickly, Pa.
G. R. Bliss (Crozer Theological Seminary), Lewisburg, Pa.
James R. Boise, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
James P. Boyce, So. Baptist Theol. Seminary, Greenville, S. C.
W. F. Bradbury, High School, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles E. Brandt, Farmington, Ct.
Fisk P. Brewer, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
Charles H. Brigham (Meadville Theol. School), Ann Arbor, Mich.
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
John C. Bull, American Asylum, Hartford, Ct.
Elihu Burritt, New Britain, Ct.
Horatio Q. Butterfield, 62 Bible House, New York.
Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
Franklin Carter, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
Alexis Caswell, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Talbot W. Chambers, 70 West Thirty-sixth street, New York.
Henry L. Chapman, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Elie Charlier (Life Member), Institute for Young Men, 124 East Twenty-fourth street, New York.
Elisée Charlier, Institute for Young Ladies, Madison avenue and West Thirty-third street, New York.
Francis J. Child, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lyman Coleman, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
George F. Comfort, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
William B. Corby, Quincy, Ill.

- A. Crittenden, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Howard Crosby, University of New York (116 East 19th street), New York.
 Edward P. Crowell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
 H. A. Dearborn (Tufts College), Malden, Mass.
 Mrs. M. W. De Munn, Providence, R. I.
 Schele De Vere, University of Virginia, Charlotte, Va.
 Mary C. Dickinson, Northampton, Mass.
 Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 E. S. Dulin, Stephen's Female College, Columbia, Mo.
 Morton W. Easton, East Tennessee University, Knoxville, Tenn.
 George R. Entler, Franklin, N. Y.
 Carl W. Ernst, Providence, R. I.
 Leon C. Field, Concord, N. H.
 J. B. Feuling, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 Gustavus Fischer, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
 William W. Fowler, Durham, Ct.
 J. N. Fradenburgh, State Normal School, Mansfield, Pa.
 Homer T. Fuller, St. Johnsbury Academy, St. Johnsbury, Vt.
 Horace Howard Furness, Philadelphia, Pa.
 William L. Gage, Hartford, Ct.
 James M. Garnett, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
 Merrill E. Gates, Albany Academy, Albany, N. Y.
 Edwin Ginn, Boston, Mass.
 Frederick B. Ginn, Boston, Mass.
 William A. Goodwin, Portland, Me.
 William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 Richard T. Greener, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
 James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 J. M. Gregory, Illinois Industrial University, Champaign, Ill.
 Ephraim W. Gurney, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 S. S. Haldeman (University of Pennsylvania), Columbia, Pa.
 Horatio Hale, Clinton, Ontario, Canada.
 G. C. Hall, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O.
 Charles Hammond, Monson Academy, Monson, Mass.
 Lucian H. Hammond, Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.
 James H. Hanson, Classical Institute, Waterville, Me.
 Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 Calvin S. Harrington, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.
 Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
 Willabe Haskell, Bucksport, Maine.
 B. J. Hawthorne, State Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oregon.
 Theophilus Heness, School of Modern Languages, Cambridge, Mass.
 Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Newport, R. I.
 George O. Holbrooke, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
 Alvah Hovey, Theological Seminary, Newton, Mass.
 Albert H. Hoyt, 18 Somerset street, Boston, Mass.
 Selah Howell, Christian Biblical Institute, Stanfordville, N. Y.
 Milton M. Humphreys, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
 John T. Huntington, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.

William H. Jeffers, Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio.
Alexander Johnson, New Brunswick, N. J.
Edwin E. Johnson, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
John L. Johnson, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss.
J. C. M. Johnston, New Haven, Ct.
Edward S. Joynes, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
Asahel C. Kendrick, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
Robert P. Keep, Hartford, Ct.
D. B. King, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Louis Kistler, North Western University, Evanston, Ill.
Albert G. Lawrence, Newport, R. I.
L. M. Lawson, 4 Wall street, New York.
U. W. Lawton, Jackson, Mich.
J. S. Lee, St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y.
John M. Leonard, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
John R. Leslie, Newport, R. I.
D. P. Lindsley, Andover, Mass.
William S. Liscomb, Providence, R. I.
Abiel A. Livermore, Unitarian Theological Seminary, Meadville, Pa.
Charles Louis Loos, Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.
Thomas R. Lounsbury, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
Rebecca S. Lowrey, 162 West Forty-seventh street, New York.
Merrick Lyon, University Grammar School, Providence, R. I.
Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
Edward H. Magill, Swarthmore College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Irving J. Manatt, Denison University, Granville, O.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Dan Marvin, Jr., St. John's Grammar School, Stamford, Ct.
R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Washington Matthews, New York.
Cyrus V. Mays, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
Charles M. Mead, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
John Meigs, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York.
Joseph Milliken, Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, Columbus, O.
E. C. Mitchell, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
A. H. Mixer, Rochester University, Rochester, N. Y.
William L. Montague, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Charles D. Morris, Lake Mohegan, Peekskill, N. Y.
F. A. Muhlenberg, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.
Joseph H. Myers, Milton-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Bennett H. Nash, 62 Boylston street, Boston, Mass.
Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
C. W. Nassau, Lawrenceville, N. J.
William M. Nevin, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
S. M. Newman, Taunton, Mass.
Cyrus Nutt, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
C. M. O'Keefe, 45 Willoughby street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

- Lewis R. Packard, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
 William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
 E. G. Parsons, Byfield, Mass.
 Tracy Peck, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 William T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I.
 William C. Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 Noah Porter, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
 Samuel Porter, National College of Deaf-Mutes, Washington, D. C.
 Sydney P. Pratt, 7 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.
 Charles W. Reid, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
 De Witt Reiley, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
 H. B. Richardson, High School, Springfield, Mass.
 Leonard W. Richardson, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
 W. G. Richardson, Central University, Richmond, Ky.
 Matthew B. Riddle, Theological Institute of Connecticut, Hartford, Ct.
 Ezekiel G. Robinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 Edwin R. Ruggles, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
 Julius Sachs, Classical School, 4 West Forty-seventh street, New York.
 George W. Samson, Rutgers Female College, New York.
 Wesley C. Sawyer, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Philip Schaff, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
 J. W. Schermerhorn, Bond street, New York.
 Henry Schliemann, Paris, France.
 John S. Sewall, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine.
 Jotham B. Sewall, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine.
 Thomas D. Seymour, Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio.
 L. A. Sherman, Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven, Ct.
 J. A. Shores, Connecticut Literary Institute, Suffield, Ct.
 Charles Short, Columbia College, New York.
 Samuel S. Shute, Columbian University, Washington, D. C.
 Hiran W. Sibley, Rochester, N. Y.
 Leopold Simonson, Hartford, Ct.
 E. Snyder, Illinois Industrial University, Champaign, Ill.
 Ephraim G. Squier, 135 East Thirty-ninth street, New York.
 M. C. Stebbins, High School, Springfield, Mass.
 Benjamin F. Stem, Classical Institute, Easton, Pa.
 Frederick Stengel, School of Mines of Columbia College, New York.
 William A. Stevens, Denison University, Granville, Ohio.
 Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
 John Swinton, 134 East Thirty-eighth street, New York.
 J. Henry Thayer, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
 William Thompson, Theological Institute of Connecticut, Hartford, Ct.
 Crawford H. Toy, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S. C.
 J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Ct.
 Joseph A. Turner, Hollins Institute, Botetourt Springs, Va.
 Francis W. Tustin, University at Lewisburg, Va.
 Edward H. Twining, State University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 William S. Tyler, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
 Milton Valentine, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

- James C. Van Benschoten, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.
Addison Van Name, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
Julia E. Ward, Mount Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, Mass.
Minton Warren, High School, Waltham, Mass.
James C. Welling, Columbian University, Washington, D. C.
Henry G. Weston, Crozier Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.
J. B. Weston, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.
Mrs. A. E. Weston, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.
Albert S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Ct.
George H. White, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
John Williams White, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
W. H. Whitsitt, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S. C.
William D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
J. Colver Wightman, Taunton, Mass.
Alonzo Williams, Friends' School, Providence, R. I.
Edwin H. Wilson, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
C. T. Winchester, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.
John H. Wright, Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, Columbus, O.
Stephen J. Young, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine.
Robert B. Youngman, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.